

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **12 December 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, and 21. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Chaudhuri et al. (USPN 7,194,451, hereinafter “Chaudhuri”).

In a phone conversation on **28 February 2008**, Examiner and Applicant discussed the distinctions between Chaudhuri and claim 1 of the instant application. Examiner suggested clarifying that claim 1 is directed to the detection of SQL injection.

Applicant wishes to point out the following distinctions between the present invention and Chaudhuri:

(1) The query signature in the present invention comprises SQL keywords without SQL literals (see [0038-0039] of the instant application) and is **extracted** from the query itself. In contrast, the signature in Chaudhuri is an integer **assigned** to a query (see FIG. 4, col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 2, and col. 4, line 62–col. 5, line 5 of Chaudhuri). Although Chaudhuri mentions matching query text in col. 7, lines 54-60, this is simply a brute-force text-based comparison between two query strings and can only be used to “differentiate different *parameter-less* stored procedure.” In other words, the text-based comparison mentioned in Chaudhuri does not differentiate SQL keywords from SQL literals. In fact, in the same section, Chaudhuri claims that such text comparison “is undesirable due to its sensitivity to formatting and **its inability to identify different instances of the same query with different parameters**” and advocates using numbers as signatures.

(2) Chaudhuri discloses a system for monitoring database performance. Particularly, Chaudhuri discloses grouping queries with the same signatures in an aggregation table for performance comparisons (see col. 5, lines 3-5 and abstract

of Chaudhury). In contrast, the present invention uses query signatures to identify queries that have been hacked by SQL injection. When a query is SQL injected, the system rejects the query (see [0038-0040] of the instant application).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify these points. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0038-0040] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao /
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 29 February 2008

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com